

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

JUSTIN RIDDLE,
Plaintiff,
v.
OMAHA PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Defendant.

Case No. 8-23-cv-00455-RFR-MDN

FILED
U.S. DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA
2023 OCT 30 AM 10:11
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

PLAINTIFF'S BRIEF IN OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF
TIME

Plaintiff Justin Riddle respectfully submits this Brief in Opposition to Defendant Omaha Public Schools' Motion for Extension of Time to File Responsive Pleading:

Defendant's motion should be denied because they have failed to demonstrate good cause for an extension beyond 30 days, as required by the rules. Defendant vaguely claims they need additional time for interviews but provides no details about who needs to be interviewed or why over 30 extra days are required.

Remarkably, while Defendant asks for 30 additional days, the proposed new deadline they provide - November 27 - is itself more than 30 days from when they filed for removal on October 18. The mismatch between their rationale and proposed date indicates the request is arbitrary rather than based on any actual need.

Moreover, Defendant failed to act diligently by waiting until the last minute to file for removal and should not benefit from their tactical delay. Additional complex briefing is unnecessary for this straightforward First Amendment case. Further delay prejudices Plaintiff by dragging out resolution of this important case.

Plaintiff proposes an alternative revised briefing schedule within the normal 30 day extension period. Should the Court grant some extension, Plaintiff requests that responsive pleadings be due by [30 DAYS FROM OCTOBER 18] on November 17.

For all these reasons, Defendant's motion for extension of time should be denied as unjustified. But Plaintiff stands ready to proceed with resolving this case on the merits in a timely fashion.

Respectfully submitted,
Justin Riddle
Pro Se Litigant
402-813-2156

